

## RE: Wallace Yard - checking in

Trueblood, Craig to: Clifford Villa

Cc: SHimmelh, Ed Moreen, Darrell.Early, Nicholas.Zilka, Sara.Handy, Gail.Wurtzler, "Lawrence, Robert"

09/11/2009 02:07 PM

Cliff,

From BNSF's perspective, we are still on schedule. You should have received the revised RAWP on 9/4, Arcadis has people in the field gathering information needed to provide the additional level of detail we discussed on 8/27, and we fully expect that you will have revised RAD Drawings no later than 9/25 (4 weeks after our last meeting/call). Bob or Gail can chime in here for UPRR.

We can have a call between now and 9/25 if you would like. I plan to be in Seattle and in the office the next two weeks.

## Craig T.

----Original Message---From: Villa.Clifford@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Villa.Clifford@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 11, 2009 12:18 PM
To: Lawrence, Robert
Cc: Trueblood, Craig; SHimmelh@enrd.usdoj.gov;
Moreen.Ed@epamail.epa.gov;
Darrell.Early@deq.idaho.gov;
Nicholas.Zilka@deq.idaho.gov;
Sara.Handy@arcadis-us.com;
Gail.Wurtzler@dgslaw.com
Subject: Wallace Yard - checking in

Bob, et al --

I'm checking in on progress on the revised RAD drawings. Consistent with your message below, we understood that our required revisions, as we discussed in our call two weeks ago, should take three or four weeks to complete. Assuming things are still on track, we would therefore expect to receive the revised RAD drawings by the end of next week or the week after at the latest.

If we have the revised RADs by Sept. 25 and they are consistent with our discussion on Aug. 27, then I believe we should be able to assemble a final package and lodge the CD in time to avoid the litigation track

without the need to seek a stay.

If this vision still seems viable, please confirm. If in doubt, perhaps we should schedule another call next week.

Regards,

Cliff Villa Assistant Regional Counsel U.S. EPA Region 10

> "Lawrence, Robert"

<Robert.Lawrence

То

@dgslaw.com> "Himmelhoch,

Sarah (ENRD)"

<Sarah.Himmelhoch@usdoj.gov>,

08/28/2009 06:03 Clifford

Villa/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

PM

CC

"Lawrence,

Robert"

<Robert.Lawrence@dgslaw.com>,

"Wurtzler,

Gail"

<Gail.Wurtzler@dgslaw.com>,

"Trueblood,

Craig"

<craig.trueblood@klgates.com>

Subject

Wallace Yard

Consent Decree -

Litigation

Confidential Settlement Communication Submitted under FRE 408

Re: Wallace Yard Consent Decree and Litigation
Sarah and Cliff,

I'm not sure whether my e-mails to Sara are getting through the  ${\tt DOJ}$ 

firewall. Some are returned with a "can't deliver" note. In any event,

I wanted to be sure that both of you were aware of the following:

 Neither Gail nor I can waive service for UP. Bob Bylsma,

 $\mbox{\sc UP's in-house}$  counsel based out of Sacramento, has the authority

to do this in certain situations. Bob's number is 916-789-6229.

Please advise me if you are interested in Bob possibly accepting

or waiving service for UP, and I will give  $\mathop{\text{\rm him}}\nolimits$  a heads up that you

will be giving him a call.

2) Based upon our telephone call with Cliff, Ed Moreen and Nick

Zilka yesterday, it appears that we are making good progress

towards settlement. The vast majority of the remaining issues

appear related to the degree of detail that  ${\tt EPA}$  wants in the  ${\tt RAD}$ 

drawings and the RAWP, and not on major significant technical

differences of opinion. The language in the CD and SOW is final,

subject of course to our respective clients final management

review and approval.

3) As we advised Cliff, Ed and Nick, we think the last set of  $\$ 

 $\,$  RAD drawings that we provided to EPA supplied more than enough

detail for the Agencies to understand, review and approve the  $\,$ 

response actions that the RRs will be undertaking, and to oversee

these actions in the field. Nevertheless, in the interest of

settlement, we are willing to provide more detail so long as  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{EPA}}$ 

understands that it will take time to undertake the necessary

field work and to revise the RAD drawings appropriately. EPA has

indicated that the level of detail set forth in the Wallace Mullan

Branch Trail of the Coeur d'Alene CD RAD drawings may be

appropriate in certain instances. But those Trail RAD drawings

took well over a year to develop (sometimes even longer) often

involving many revisions. Further, the Trail of the Coeur

d'Alene's was a more complex project; the level

of detail in those

drawings is not necessary for the Spur Line drawings. In any

event, to prepare RAD drawings like those under the Wallace Mullan  $\,$ 

Branch CD for the Trail of the Coeur d'Alenes would take a minimum  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

of three to four weeks. This could be done, but in our view is

unnecessary and would result in further delays in lodging of the

CD. As a compromise, we suggest that the parties agree that

some level of additional detail between that set forth in the  $\,$ 

Coeur d'Alene RAD drawings and our current set of RAD drawings is

sufficient and would give the Agencies sufficient detail to better

understand the work that will be done and to oversee this work.

The more detail that is required, the more time it will take for  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) =\left$ 

us to get the drawings to the Agency; the less detail required the  $\,$ 

more quickly we can deliver the RAD drawings.

4) UP cannot sign the Consent Decree until the Parties have

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$  come to final agreement on the RAD Drawings that will be attached

to the CD at the staff level, and UP management has reviewed and  $\,$ 

approved the final CD. Because this will take some time for

the reasons described above, we suggest that the U.S. file a  $\,$ 

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{motion}}$  advising Judge Lodge that we are making good progress

towards settlement, and requesting that the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Judge}}$  stay the case

while the parties work out the final issues in settlement. This  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

would allow the parties to focus on achieving settlement rather  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

than expending time, energy and money on unnecessary litigation.

We appreciate the fact that the U.S. has held off on service to  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots \right\}$ 

date, and request that the U.S. continue to refrain from serving  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

the summons and complaint unless the unlikely event occurs that

settlement discussions have broken down.

Let's discuss the above next week at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[original signed by]

Robert W. Lawrence
Davis Graham & Stubbs LLP
1550 17th Street, Suite 500
Denver, CO 80202-1500
303-892-7409 direct
303-892-9400 main
(b) (6)
303-893-1379 fax
robert.lawrence@dgslaw.com

craig.trueblood@klgates.com.

This electronic message contains information from the law firm of K&L Gates LLP. The contents may be privileged and confidential and are intended for the use of the intended addressee(s) only. If you are not an intended addressee, note that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact me at